

Naval War College Review

Volume 33

Number 1 *January-February*

Article 16

1980

Soviet Armed Forces Review Annual- Volume 3 (1979)

Joseph E. Thach Jr

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Thach, Joseph E. Jr (1980) "Soviet Armed Forces Review Annual- Volume 3 (1979)," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 33 : No. 1 , Article 16.

Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol33/iss1/16>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

100 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

military institutions and by the patterns of popular military participation." In support on this theme Janowitz suggests that the period from 1920 to 1975 saw the "perfection" of the mass military institution and, in turn, its transformation by means of the elimination of conscription. It is the author's contention that the military mobilization for World War I and World War II operated to strengthen social equality and promote social integration, while the limited wars of Korea and particularly Vietnam acted to increase social inequality and alienate the veteran from the larger society. The reduction of armed forces after 1945 and their change into an all-volunteer force in 1973 are seen as having the potential for increasing the strain in civil-military relations. A reflection of this strain is a continuing separation of the military from the larger society, with only selective relationships.

In support of this hypothesis, Janowitz presents empirical data and analyses of three topics relevant to the relationship of the military and society: trends in expenditures for the military compared with spending for welfare; differential patterns of military service and of combat casualties by social groupings; and the consequences of military service on veteran status, including the transition back to civilian life.

Of the more thought-provoking conclusions drawn by Janowitz concerning sociomilitary relationships is that "[a] system of conscription which does not rest on widespread and almost universal service of the eligibles loses its validity and legitimacy." He suggests that one result of the substitution of an all-volunteer military for "peacetime conscription" is that "... the significance of military service as a mechanism for defining citizenship has been fundamentally undermined."

This review has given but a brief description of only one of the relationships examined by Janowitz. The

thoroughness of the research and the completeness of subject areas are not open to criticism. It would, however, be impossible for the interested reader to fail to gain some insight into the changes that have occurred during *The Last Half-Century*.

ANDREW E. VAN ESSO
Arizona State University

Jones, David R., ed. *Soviet Armed Forces Review Annual—Volume 3* (1979). Gulf Breeze, Fla.: Academic International Press, 1979. 364pp.

In the not too distant past Western analysts of the Soviet scene were often handicapped by a dearth of reliable public data on the USSR's Military Establishment. Since the early 1970s this situation has reversed itself to such a degree that one is now confronted with a wide variety of publications, nearly all of which are promoted as the absolute "last word" on current trends and events within the Soviet military realm. Consequently the educated reader must seek a reliable, comprehensive reference work that treats this vast and intricate topic. The latest volume of the *Soviet Armed Forces Review Annual* (SAFRA) series fills the bill in admirable fashion.

This is not to say that the series has not experienced growing pains over its first three issues. Unlike the first two volumes, which had a 2-year time lag in their coverage of the Soviet Armed Forces components and related elements of military power, SAFRA-3 covers the previous 2 years' (1977-78) activities and in some cases, e.g., Carl Jacobsen's examination of Soviet actions during the February-March 1979 Sino-Vietnamese border conflict, manages to be as current as yesterday's news reports.

Another attractive feature of the SAFRA series has been its consistency in the selection of its contributors. For example, most of the authors of those annual sections dealing with the Soviet

PROFESSIONAL READING 101

Armed Forces components and other key areas relating to military power, which comprise the vital heart of the SAFRA effort, have contributed to all three volumes published thus far. While some might choose to debate the catholicity of viewpoints expressed, this practice has permitted a good measure of continuity. Because the majority of SAFRA contributors are younger scholars, but with extensive and impressive publishing credentials in the Soviet field, few should have any fears about the high calibre of Western scholarship on Soviet military affairs in future years. If editor Jones has made some adjustment for reasons of timeliness in his yearly review section and has continued his annual bibliographic survey of Soviet military affairs, he has also broadened the scope of the volume's format with some excellent papers dealing with both the crucial present and oft-neglected past of the Soviet military. John McDonnell's treatment of the Soviet weapons acquisition system is a definitive assessment of this vital technological issue, while those by Jacob W. Kipp and Ronald R. Rader on Admiral Gorshkov and pre-WW II Anglo-French estimates of the Red army, respectively, rank as first-class historical scholarship. Most important, the SAFRA effort, unlike some similar scholarly enterprises, is not a "closed shop" affair. Rather, Jones continues to invite inquiries from any scholar who wishes to contribute to future SAFRA volumes.

SAFRA's reference value is further enhanced with the presence of considerable graphic and tabular data that complement the various textual sections, particularly those addressing the current status of the Soviet force components and the high command structure.

SAFRA-3's high-quality analysis includes treatments of those elements of national power (e.g., defense industry, space activities, etc.) that are not always examined in surveys of Soviet military affairs. Such outstanding features might

dispose even the most penurious among Soviet area specialists and interested general readers to invest the required \$35 for this annual investment in superior scholarship on Soviet military affairs.

JOSEPH E. THACH, JR.
Office of the Assistant
Secretary of Defense for
Public Affairs

Keijzer, Nico. *Military Obedience*.
Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands: Sijthoff & Noordhoff, 1978.
312pp.

This is a well-researched, well-written treatise by a former Dutch naval officer on the subject of military obedience or, more accurately, the defense of superior orders. It is a comprehensive analysis of the application of that defense in military practice.

The subject of superior orders always has had a certain fascination for scholars. There was a spate of writing by academicians during and after the post-World War II war crimes trials. The Vietnam war apparently inspired a resurgence of intellectual pontification, given that this is the third such scholarly contribution on the subject in little more than a decade.

To be sure, there are legalistic nuances regarding the defense as it is stated by various nations. The defense in the United States is a "reasonable man" test, i.e., would a man of ordinary sense and understanding have realized that the order given him (which resulted in the offense with which the accused stands charged) was illegal? If the court answers this question in the negative, the defense serves as a complete defense to the charge. It is a defense seldom attempted and even more rarely achieved. In contrast, the British, while not permitting a claim of superior orders as a complete bar to trial, nevertheless allow it to be heard in mitigation of the offense prior to sentencing. From